

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled, while claim 8 has been made a proper independent claim and includes the limitations of cancelled claim 7. In addition, claim 5 has been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, in that the limitation "forming a difference signal, the difference signal being equal to the intermediate signal minus the reduced word-length signal" is not disclosed in the drawings.

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, this rejection was first raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed November 16, 2004. In response thereto, Applicant's Amendment mailed February 16, 2005, included a new drawing sheet containing new Fig. 2, and stated on page 12 thereof "The limitations of claim 9 find support in the specification as filed on page 7, lines 6-9. In addition, new Fig. 2 now shows the limitations of claim 9." A review of PAIR shows the receipt, on February 18, 2005, of a REPLACEMENT SHEET containing revised Fig. 1, as well as a new drawing sheet containing new Fig. 2.

Applicant believes that the above changes and explanation answer the Examiner's objection to claim 5 and the 35 U.S.C. 112,

PHNL000467-AMT-111605

8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


paragraph 1, rejection of claim 9, and respectfully requests withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,287,420 to Barrett in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,652 to Heddle. The Examiner has further rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,901,178 to Lee et al. in view of Barrett. Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner has allowed claims 3, 12 and 16, and has found claims 5 and 8 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections have been overcome.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 16, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611

PHNL000467-AMT-111605

9

BEST AVAILABLE COPY